

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/614,293	07/08/2003	Jong-Weon Moon	8733.903.00-US	7386
30827	7590 09/12/2005		EXAMINER	
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP			CALEY, MICHAEL H	
1900 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20006			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASIMAG	20000		2871	

DATE MAILED: 09/12/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			- 37
•	Application No.	Applicant(s)	707
0.55	10/614,293	MOON, JONG-WEON	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michael H. Caley	2871	
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet	with the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPITHE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a re  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).		a reply be timely filed  nirty (30) days will be considered timely.  DNTHS from the mailing date of this communication  ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	<b>.</b>
Status			
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08.	June 2005.		
· _ ·	is action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allow	ance except for formal ma	itters, prosecution as to the merits is	;
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C	D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4)  Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the applicatio 4a) Of the above claim(s) 12-20 is/are withdra 5)  Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6)  Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected. 7)  Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	awn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examin 10) The drawing(s) filed on 08 July 2003 is/are: a		acted to by the Eveniner	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the		•	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	, ,	n.
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E			.,.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documer 2. Certified copies of the priority documer 3. Copies of the certified copies of the pri application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received.  Ints have been received in  It is in the contract of	Application No In received in this National Stage	
Attachment(s)		ì	
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)	
<ol> <li>Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> <li>Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date</li> </ol>		o(s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 	

Art Unit: 2871

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-7 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moon (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2001/0026335 "Moon '335" in view of Moon et al. (KR 2001-0111863 "Moon '863").

Regarding claim 1, Moon '335 discloses a liquid crystal display having:

first and second substrates (Figure 5 elements 550 and 500) facing and spaced apart from each other;

a retardation layer (Figure 5 element 552) on an outer surface of the first substrate;

a linear polarizing layer (Figure 5 element 554) on the retardation layer;

a cholesteric liquid crystal color filter (Figure 5 element 200) layer on an inner surface of the second substrate and having a first helical pitch of a first circular polarization direction (Page 1 [0014]);

a first cholesteric liquid crystal polarizing layer (Figure 5 element 150) on an outer surface of the second substrate and having a first helical pitch of a first circular polarization direction (Page 4 [0052]); and

Art Unit: 2871

a backlight unit outside the second CLC polarizing layer (Figure 5 element 50).

Moon '335 fails to disclose a second CLC polarizing layer on the first CLC polarizing layer having a second helical pitch of a second circular polarization direction opposite to the first circular polarization direction. Moon '863, however teaches a combination of first and second CLC polarizers adjacent to one another having opposite helical pitch directions (Figure 3 elements 12 and 13a; Column 5, line 9 – Column 6 line 10) in addition to a cholesteric color filter (Figure 3 element 15).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have configured the display device disclosed by Moon '335 to have first and second CLC polarizing layers having pitch directions of opposite directions according to the teachings of Moon '863. One would have been motivated to form an additional CLC polarizing layer according to the teachings of Moon '863 to efficiently make use of the light from the light source by repetitively reflecting the light between the CLC layers and the reflecting plate and so that it may exit the CLC color filter in a specific visible light band (Column 5 line 54 – Column 6 line 5). Such an improvement is taught by Moon '863 to improve the efficiency of the light source and the color purity of the display (Column 2 lines 3-30).

The examiner notes that U.S. Patent No. 6,597,418 to Moon et al. is used as an English version of the Korean document.

Regarding claims 2-7, Moon '335 fails to disclose the first and second CLC polarizers having the proposed properties. Moon '863, however, teaches one CLC polarizing layer as

Art Unit: 2871

having a discrete pitch (element 13a) and one CLC polarizing layer having a continuous pitch (element 12). Moon '863 teaches the discrete helical pitch as corresponding to bands of wavelengths adjacent to red, green and blue colors (Column 5 lines 29-31, 54-65) and the second helical pitch as corresponding to a broadband of wavelength (Column 5 lines 23-65). Moon '863 further teaches the CCF layer as having a third helical pitch in the same direction of the discrete pitch corresponding to wavelengths of red, green and blue colors (Column 5 line 54 – Column 6 line 11) and each of the cholesteric layers as having one of a right-handed and left-handed polarization direction (Column 5 lines 23-31).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have configured the display device disclosed by Moon '335 to have first and second CLC polarizing layers having pitch directions as proposed. One would have been motivated to form an additional CLC polarizing layer according to the teachings of Moon '863 to efficiently make use of the light from the light source by repetitively reflecting the light between the CLC layers and the reflecting plate and so that it may exit the CLC color filter in a specific visible light band (Column 5 line 54 – Column 6 line 5). Such an improvement is taught by Moon '863 to improve the efficiency of the light source and the color purity of the display (Column 2 lines 3-30).

Regarding claim 11, Moon '335 discloses the retardation layer as a quarter wave plate (Page 4 [0051]).

Art Unit: 2871

Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moon '335 in view of Moon '863 and in further view of Honda et al. (U.S. Patent No. 2002/0012085 "Honda").

Moon '335 as modified by Moon '863 fails to disclose a diffusing layer between the first substrate and the retardation layer and a compensation layer between the retardation layer and the linear polarizer. Honda, however, teaches such a diffusing layer as an improved method of scattering light in a transflective display (Page 1 [0004]-[0006]); Figure 9 element 11). Furthermore, Honda teaches a compensation layer of viewing angle (22) between the retardation layer (23) and the linear polarizer (21).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have formed a diffusing layer and compensation layer of viewing angle as proposed in the display device disclosed by Moon '335. One would have been motivated to construct the display device with such a diffusing layer and compensation layer as a means of maintaining uniform viewing characteristics such as color and brightness across a range of viewing angles (Page 1 [0006]-[0009]).

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moon '335 in view of Moon '863 and in further view of Arakawa et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0036735 "Arakawa").

Moon '335 as modified by Moon '863 fails to disclose the backlight unit as emitting light of a spectrum having peaks at wavelength bands corresponding to red, green, and blue colors.

Art Unit: 2871

Arakawa, however, teaches such a light source used in combination with a cholesteric liquid crystal polarization layer in a liquid crystal display (Page 2 [0035]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used a backlight having an emission characteristic as proposed. One would have been motivated to use such a backlight having an emission spectrum with peaks at red, green, and blue so that a higher percentage of the light may be transmitted through one of the color filters to increase the efficiency of the display according to conventional methods.

## Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-11 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

#### **Contact Information**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael H. Caley whose telephone number is (571) 272-2286. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 a.m. - 5:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Kim can be reached on (571) 272-2293. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2871

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Michael H. Caley August 20, 2005 mhc

TARIFUR R. CHOWDHURY PRIMARY EXAMINER